REMARKS

Claims 1, 24, 46 and 54 have been amended as indicated above in accompaniment of a Request for Continued Examination under 37 C.F.R. § 1.114. The Applicant respectfully requests that this application be allowed and forwarded on to issuance.

Telephonic Communications

Applicant conversed briefly with the Examiner via telephone on May 26, 2006. A proposed amendment to independent claim 1 was transmitted to the Examiner for consideration and comment later that same day. Applicant attempted follow-up telephone contact with the Examiner on June 14, 2006 that was unsuccessful. Applicant has not received any comment from the Examiner with respect to the proposed claim amendment. While Applicant believes that such modifications are unnecessary, in the spirit of advancing prosecution of this matter, Applicant has made the clarifying amendments listed above and discussed below.

§ 102 and § 103 Rejections

Claims 1-2, 5, 24-25, 28, 46, 49 and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,963,940 ("Liddy").

Claims 3, 26 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liddy in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,999,942 ("Talati").

Claims 4, 27 and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liddy in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,895,552 ("Balabanovic").

Claims 6-7, 29-30 and 50-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Liddy in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,480,843 ("Li").

Claims 8, 31 and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liddy in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,682,539 ("Conrad").

Claims 9, 32 and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liddy in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,366,908 ("Chong").

Claims 1-2, 5, 24-25, 28, 46, 49 and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5, 873,076 ("Barr"), in view of Liddy. Applicant believes in good faith that this rejection was cited under § 102(b) in error and that rejection under § 103(a) was the true intent of the Examiner (page 15 of Final Office action).

Claims 4, 27 and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barr in view of Balabanovic.

Claims 6-7, 29-30 and 50-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barr in view of Li.

Claims 8, 31 and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barr in view of Conrad.

Claims 9, 32 and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barr in view of Chong.

The Claims

Claim 1 (as amended) recites in a computer system, a method comprising (emphasis added):

- detecting input from a user, wherein the input corresponds to a *present user context*;
- analyzing at least a subset of the input;

11

- predicting desired access to one or more media files based on the analysis;
- retrieving information corresponding to one or more media files from a media content source, *wherein the information was generated responsive to a user context previous to and different from the present user context*; and
- presenting the information to a user for suggested access.

Applicant respectfully disagrees and traverses the Office's rejection. The Applicant believes that the following excerpt helps in understanding important features as recited by claim 1, as amended (emphasis added):

> In contrast to such conventional procedures, the following arrangements and procedures provide for an intelligent media agent to *autonomously collect semantic multimedia data text descriptions on behalf of a user whenever and wherever the user accesses multimedia data*. The media agent analyzes these semantic multimedia data text descriptions in view of *user behavior patterns* and actions to assist the user in identifying multimedia content that is appropriate to the *context within which the user is operating or working*. To accomplish this, *the media agent provides timely prompts with suggested multimedia content and/or information corresponding to media content* (e.g., suggested media filenames). Specification at page 5, line 21 to page 6, line 4.

In other words, the subject matter of the Application relates to multimedia data and information corresponding thereto that is collected (i.e., generated) whenever and wherever a user encounters such multimedia data and related information in the digital realm (e.g., the Internet, etc.) during *prior* user contexts. User behavior patterns can then be used to trigger the suggestion of particular information for inclusion within a *present* user context.

The Applicant asserts that none of the respectively cited references to Liddy, Talati, Balabonovic, Li, Conrad, Chong and Barr – whether taken alone, or in any possible set or subset combination - provides, teaches or suggests detecting

input from a user, wherein the input corresponds to **a present user context**, and retrieving information corresponding to one or more media files from a media content source, **wherein the information was generated responsive to a user context previous to and different from the present user context**, as recited by claim 1, as amended.

Accordingly, the Office's respective rejections for anticipation and *prima facie* obviousness against claim 1, as amended, fails for at least these foregoing reasons.

Claims 2-9 are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim.

Claim 24 (as amended) recites a computer-readable medium comprising computer-executable instructions for (emphasis added):

- detecting user input corresponding to a *present user context*; and
- responsive to detecting the user input and independent of whether the user input is associated with an explicit query:
- analyzing at least a subset of the user input in view of semantic text and user intention and preference patterns, the semantic text comprising the at least a subset and previously collected text from a personal media database customized for the user, the previously collected text being semantically related to one or more previous multimedia accesses by the user;
- predicting desired access to one or more media files based on the analysis;
- retrieving information corresponding to one or more media files from a media content source, *wherein the retrieved information was generated in response to a user context previous to and different from the present user context*; and
- presenting the information as a suggestion.

Applicant respectfully disagrees and traverses the Office's rejection. For at least reasons substantially analogous to those argued above in regard to claim 1 (as amended), the Applicant asserts that the respective rejections for anticipation and

prima facie obviousness against claim 24, as amended, fail at least for lack of supportive subject matter within the references and must be withdrawn.

Claims 25-32 are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim.

Claim 46 (as amended) recites a computing device comprising (emphasis added):

- a processor:
- a memory coupled to the processor, the memory comprising computer-executable instructions, the processor being configured to fetch and execute the computer-executable instructions for:
  - detecting user input corresponding to *a present user context*; and
  - responsive to detecting the user input and independent of whether the user input is associated with an explicit query:
  - analyzing the user input;
  - predicting desired access to one or more media files based on the analysis;
  - retrieving information corresponding to one or more media files from a media content source, *wherein the information was generated responsive to a user context previous to and different from the present user context*; and
  - presenting the information as a suggestion.

Applicant respectfully disagrees and traverses the Office's rejection. For at least reasons substantially analogous to those argued above in regard to claim 1 (as amended), the Applicant asserts that the respective rejections for anticipation and *prima facie* obviousness against claim 46, as amended, fail at least for lack of supportive subject matter within the references and must be withdrawn.

Claims 47-53 are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim.

Claim 54 (as amended) recites a computing device comprising (emphasis added):

- processing means for:
  - detecting user input in *a present user context*; and
  - responsive to detecting the user input and independent of whether the user input is associated with a query:
    - analyzing the user input;
    - predicting desired access to one or more media files based on the analysis;
    - retrieving information corresponding to one or more media files from a media content source, *wherein the retrieved information was generated in response to a user context previous to and different from the present user context*; and
    - presenting the information as a suggestion.

Applicant respectfully disagrees and traverses the Office's rejection. For at least reasons substantially analogous to those argued above in regard to claim 1 (as amended), the Applicant asserts that the respective rejections for anticipation and *prima facie* obviousness against claim 54, as amended, fail at least for lack of supportive subject matter within the references and must be withdrawn.

Conclusion

The pending claims are in condition for allowance and action to that end is respectfully requested. Should any issue remain that prevents allowance of the application, the Office is encouraged to contact the undersigned prior or issuance of a subsequent Office action.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 7/24/06

By: _____

Lance R. Sadler
Reg. No. 38,605
(509) 324-9256